

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. As per Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences' Decision on Appeal 2009-001387 dated 12/22/2009, claim 1-8 rejections are reversed. Further examination has determined that claims 1-8 are to be allowed.
2. Amendment received on 10/18/2006 was entered into record. Claims 1 and 8 were amended.
3. Applicant's submission filed on 05/05/2006 was entered. Claims 1 and 8 were amended.
4. Amendment received on 11/08/2005 was entered. Claims 1 and 8 were amended. Claims 1 and 8 were previously amended on 06/15/2005.

***Priority***

5. This application has no priority claim made. The filing date is 04/20/2001.

***Reasons for Allowance***

6. Claims 1-8 are allowed as amended above.

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

The closest prior arts of record issued to Lecheler et al. (WO 00/49769), Pulsipher et al. (US 5948055 A) and Nelson et al. (US 5577252 A) together fail to teach or suggest "a method of managing a computer network, comprising the steps of: assigning to at least one collection computer a management domain identifier uniquely associated with a management domain in which each collection computer resides; receiving, in at least one management computer, information from the at least one collection computer that includes the management domain identifier and a trust flag to indicate a binary setting; deciding whether the at least one management computer should resolve a hostname being reported by the at least one collection computer based on the binary setting of the trust flag; and maintaining within the at least one management computer a database of the information accessed using the management domain identifier" in combination with all the elements of each independent claim as argued by Applicant [See items 1 and 2 in section VII of Argument as per appellant's Appeal Brief Filed on 07/06/2007]. Applicant argues that Nelson does not relate to resolving a hostname should a trust status indicate the need for a resolution, i.e., it does not teach "deciding whether the at least one management computer should resolve a hostname being reported by the at least one collection computer based on the binary setting of the trust flag." (see 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph on page 5 of Appeal Brief Filed). This argument is considered persuasive as Analysis in Patent Appeals and Interferences' Decision on Appeal 2009-001387 dated 12/22/2009.

The dependent claims further limit the independent claims and are considered allowable on the same basis as the independent claims as well as for the further limitations set forth. Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

***Conclusion***

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peling A. Shaw whose telephone number is (571) 272-7968. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00 - 4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William C. Vaughn can be reached on (571) 272-3922. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Peling A Shaw/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2444